

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-6917

CATHERINE D. RANDOLPH,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

SUPERINTENDENT,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. J. Frederick Motz, Senior District Judge. (1:11-cv-00688-JFM)

Submitted: December 22, 2011

Decided: January 5, 2012

Before KING and KEENAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Catherine D. Randolph, Appellant Pro Se. Kathleen A. Ellis, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Catherine D. Randolph seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing her 28 U.S.C.A. § 2241 (West 2006 & Supp. 2011) petition. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was not timely filed.

Parties are accorded thirty days after the entry of the district court's final judgment or order to note an appeal, Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(A), unless the district court extends the appeal period under Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5), or reopens the appeal period under Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(6). "[T]he timely filing of a notice of appeal in a civil case is a jurisdictional requirement." Bowles v. Russell, 551 U.S. 205, 214 (2007).

The district court's order was entered on the docket on May 26, 2011. The notice of appeal was filed on July 6, 2011. Because Randolph failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and deny Randolph's motion to expedite the appeal as moot. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED